



COVER SHEET
FOR
EVALUATION SCORE SHEET PACKET
FOR
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES

RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"

OPENED TUESDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2009 AT 2:30 P.M.

PROSPECTIVE PROVIDER NAME: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

EVALUATOR NAME: KEVIN GEORGE

EVALUATOR
SIGNATURE: Kevin George

TITLE: Management Review Specialist

DATE: 11/20/09

INSTRUCTIONS: Upon completion of evaluations, the Evaluator shall initial and date each score sheet, sign and date this cover sheet, and send the entire original score sheet packets with the signed Conflict of Interest Form and all instructions by overnight express mail to the Procurement Officer. All score sheet packets should be received by the Procurement Officer within 48 hours of the Debriefing session, excluding weekends and holidays. In addition, the Evaluator must return any evaluation notes or materials that have been written in or marked in any way. Copies of proposals do not have to be returned, provided notes have not been written in them.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST QUESTIONNAIRE

RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"

NAME OF PROSPECTIVE PROVIDER: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

	YES	NO
1. Do you, your immediate family, or business partner have a relationship or financial or other interests with the prospective contract awardee?	<u> </u>	<u> / </u>
2. Have gratuities, favors, or anything of monetary value been offered to you or accepted by you from the prospective contract awardee?	<u> </u>	<u> / </u>
3. Have you been employed by the prospective contract awardee within the last 24 months?	<u> </u>	<u> / </u>
4. Do you plan to obtain a financial interest; i.e., stock, in the prospective contract awardee?	<u> </u>	<u> / </u>
5. Do you, your immediate family, or business partner have a relationship, or financial or other interests in any subcontractor named by the prospective contract awardee?	<u> </u>	<u> / </u>
6. Have gratuities, favors, or anything of monetary value been offered to you or accepted by you from any subcontractor named by the prospective contract awardee?	<u> </u>	<u> / </u>
7. Have you been employed by any subcontractor named by the prospective contract awardee within the last 24 months?	<u> </u>	<u> / </u>
8. Do you plan to seek or accept future employment with any subcontractor named by the prospective contract awardee?	<u> </u>	<u> / </u>
9. Are there any other conditions that may cause a conflict of interest?	<u> </u>	<u> / </u>

If you answered "yes" to any of the above questions, **DO NOT PROCEED WITH THE EVALUATION**. Contact the Procurement Officer in charge of this procurement **IMMEDIATELY** regarding your status and attach a written explanation of your answer to this questionnaire.

I DECLARE ALL OF THE ABOVE QUESTIONS ARE ANSWERED TRUTHFULLY AND TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE.

<u>Kevin George</u>	<u>Kevin George</u>	<u>Management Review Specialist</u>	<u>11/12/09</u>
Signature	Print Name	Title	Date Signed

EVALUATION TEAM GROUND RULES AND INSTRUCTIONS

**Department of Juvenile Justice
Residential Services
RFP# R2084 "34-Bed Moderate Risk Program for Boys"**

SECTION I – GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS:

1. ALL Questions related to the solicitation document and the evaluations of the proposals must be directed to the SINGLE point of contact for the RFP, the Procurement Officer:

Jacklyn Colson, FCN, FCCM
Procurement Officer
Department of Juvenile Justice
Bureau of Contracts
2737 Centerview Drive, Suite 1116
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-3100
Phone: (850) 922-0661
Fax: (850) 414-1625
2. The Procurement Officer identified above will have screened the proposals for mandatory requirements and determined if the proposal is responsive for evaluation. As a result, the Technical Proposals which you will evaluate have met mandatory requirements and are deemed responsive for further evaluation.
3. You have been chosen to participate because of your particular skills, knowledge and experience. You have also been chosen because of the department's confidence in your ability to score both independently and fairly. The same scoring principles must be applied to every Technical Response received, independent of other evaluators.
4. All provider proposals, evaluation score sheet packets, evaluation instructions and other related documents must be held confidential. All public record requests for information concerning provider proposals, evaluation score sheet packets, evaluation instructions, etc are to be referred to the Procurement Officer.
5. Conflict of Interest Questionnaires, contained in the evaluation score sheet packet for each proposal must be completed, signed, and dated by each Evaluation Team member (individually). Any identified Conflicts of Interest will be referred immediately to the Procurement Officer and the General Counsel's Office. (Please do so before the Briefing session if possible).
6. All appearances of impropriety in the proposal evaluation process must be avoided. If in doubt, contact your Procurement Officer.
7. As a member of the evaluation team, you are expected to attend both the Briefing Session and the Debriefing Session as set forth below. **ATTENDANCE IS MANDATORY**

SECTION II – EVALUATOR BRIEFING SESSION (CONFERENCE CALL)

8. The Evaluator Briefing Session Conference Call will be held on **Monday, October 26, 2009 at 10:00 a.m.** This is a public meeting, which will be held in the Knight Building at DJJ Headquarters. **ATTENDANCE AT THIS SESSION BY ALL EVALUATORS AND THE ALTERNATE IS MANDATORY.** To attend by conference call, **call the Bureau of Contracts at 1-866-411-7380 and enter Code 3982071.** Please read the Request for Proposal and all addenda and have a copy of the documents with you during the Briefing session.

This is a public meeting, so providers may have representatives present or listening in during the Briefing Session/Conference Call.

10. You have been provided with a copy of each proposal, which should be read, evaluated and scored according to the instructions provided on the Scoring Sheets. You have also been provided a copy of an evaluation score sheet packet for each proposal.
11. Do not ask other evaluators questions or share solicitation related information. You must not solicit information or submissions from potential or interested providers. You must not consider any other information, other than the information contained in the proposal, including personal experience with provider or staff, news articles; anything heard or said about provider.
12. All questions, comments and/or concerns during evaluations, or assistance in understanding evaluation questions/considerations and proposal responses shall be directed only to the Procurement Officer. If technical assistance is needed during the evaluation, please contact the Procurement Officer, who will arrange for the appropriate technical staff to be made available to provide the answers to all members of the Evaluation Team. Requested technical information will be disseminated to all evaluators simultaneously.

SECTION III – SCORING INSTRUCTIONS

13. Each proposal must be independently scored. No collaboration between evaluation team members is permitted during the independent scoring process.
14. Scoring should reflect your independent evaluation of the provider's technical response to each evaluation question/consideration. Each evaluation question/consideration for every provider technical response must be scored against the standard/requirement set in the solicitation document.
15. You may refer to the solicitation document and addenda requirements when scoring proposals.
16. You should use Attachment O (the Prospective Providers mandatory cross-reference table) to assist you in locating information. However, you are not required to limit scoring to the specific information contained in the section identified in the crosswalk. You should include any and all information relevant to the question that is found in the proposal when scoring.
17. Do not try to infer meaning into the information that is provided. It is the prospective provider's responsibility to present the proposal in a clear and understandable manner. Evaluators are not obligated to interpret responses to make them more valuable to the Department.
18. Please ensure you understand the Scoring Sheets and the raw scoring method which is as follows:

RATING	SCORE	EVALUATION DESCRIPTION
Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

(NOTE THE SCORING DESCRIPTIONS HAVE CHANGED FROM PREVIOUSLY USED DESCRIPTIONS, SPECIFICALLY, 0 and 1 HAVE CHANGED)

19. You should evaluate every question/consideration and assign a raw score (0-5) based on an assessment of how well a provider's technical response has addressed that particular question/consideration. You are to mark the number that assigns points for each question/consideration. Please ensure you score all evaluation questions/considerations for each provider proposal on the scoring page provided for the appropriate provider.
20. All scores must be assigned utilizing the scoring range of 0 – 5. Record the score for each question/consideration (as indicated) in the box below. Take into account any information found in the proposal that relates to the question/consideration when determining the score.
21. Each score sheet has been customized to include the name of the prospective vendor and your name. On each page of each score sheet for each proposal, you shall initial and enter the date on the line provided.
22. Only the Scoring Sheets provided should be used to record scores or comments. No additional notes or marks should appear in any of the proposal documents submitted by providers. Highlighting, marks, notes, etc. should not be made in the provider technical response and no notes should be taken anywhere other than the score sheet. Do not use white out and do not erase anything!
23. In the box marked "Page Numbers", record any and all page numbers in the corresponding Technical Proposal where information that you relied upon to determine the scores for the questions/considerations was found. More than one section in the providers technical proposal may be referenced as the basis for any evaluation question/consideration scored. If the provider reply does not address an evaluation question/consideration, indicate "not addressed" and apply the appropriate score.
24. Do not attempt to provide an exhaustive list documenting every section or page where information was considered in scoring the question for the provider's technical reply. It is recommended that only the one or two main places are noted where the information evaluated was found. These notations will be used during debriefing to assure that all evaluators considered essentially the same information when scoring.
25. In the boxes marked "Notation and Comments" record brief notes regarding what information was utilized to determine the proposals' strengths and/or weaknesses and/or any concerns or exemplary findings for discussion at the debriefing. You should notate something as a reminder of the thought process utilized in determining the numerical score for the question/consideration.
26. If at any time a score for a questions/consideration is changed, do not erase or white out any scores. Mark through the score, re-score and initial and date the new score. Notate the reason for the change in the "Notation and Comments" box on the score sheet.

SECTION IV – EVALUATOR DEBRIEFING SESSION (CONFERENCE CALL)

27. The Debriefing Session/Conference Call of the Evaluation Team will be held on **Friday, November 20, 2009 at 9:00 a.m.** This meeting will be held in the Knight Building at DJJ Headquarters. **ATTENDANCE AT THIS SESSION BY ALL EVALUATORS IS MANDATORY.** To attend by conference call, call the Bureau of Contracts at 1-866-411-7380 and enter **Code 3982071**. Evaluators should have completed their independent evaluations and be prepared to discuss proposals with reference to the evaluation questions/considerations.
28. This is also a public meeting, so providers may have representatives present at the Debriefing Session or may be listening in on the conference call. The public is not allowed to make comment.
29. The purpose of the Debriefing Session is to allow for discussion of proposals, evaluation questions/considerations, including strength and/or weaknesses and/or concerns of each proposal. Scores will not be shared or recorded at this time. Discussion may be held between evaluators regarding comments, concerns or questions regarding proposal submissions or omissions.

Following the Debriefing session, evaluators are allowed the opportunity to independently re-score and/or mark final scores on any question/consideration.

31. No attempt by department personnel or others to influence an evaluator's scoring shall be tolerated. If any attempt is made, you must immediately report the incident to the Procurement Officer. If the Procurement Officer makes such an attempt, you must immediately report the incident to the Bureau Chief of Contracts.
32. After the Debriefing Session, you will be provided an opportunity to mark final scores, and initial and date each score sheet. When all scoring is complete, you shall sign your full name and enter the date on the line provided on the Cover page of the Evaluation Score Sheet packets. **NOTE:** Any changes on the score sheet to previously marked scores (marked prior to debriefing and independently changed), shall be crossed out, and the crossed out information initialed and dated. Also you must notate the reason for the change in the "Comments" box. Do not use white-out or erase anything.
33. After the Debriefing Session, you will be allowed 24 hours for re-review/evaluation.

SECTION V – RETURN OF EVALUATION MATERIALS

34. Upon completion of evaluations, you shall initial and date each score sheet, sign and date this cover sheet, and send the entire original score sheet packets with the signed conflict of interest form and all instructions by overnight express mail to the Procurement Officer. All score sheet packets should be received by the Procurement Officer within 48 hours of the Debriefing session, excluding weekends and holidays. In addition, you must return any evaluation notes or materials that have been written in or marked in any way. Copies of proposals do not have to be returned, provided notes have not been written in them.
35. If you are not in Tallahassee, you must make a copy of each score sheets packet and hand written notes to retain in a secure place for your own records. Remember, all provider proposals, score sheet packets, evaluation materials and other related documents must be held confidential until such time as the Agency posts a Notice of Agency Decision. All public record requests for information concerning provider proposals, evaluation materials, scores, etc are to be referred to the Procurement Officer.
36. The Procurement Officer shall follow up for any missing materials.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Category #1: Management Capability

How well does the proposal describe the Vendor's management capability?

Consideration 1: How well does the proposal describe management and capability to manage/control the program?

(Weighted: 5 Max Pts: 25)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

2-8

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

- On site visits by corporate management team
- Facility Performance Report; completed monthly and reviewed by executive management team on monthly phone call
- 24 access to corporate management to address operational issues
- Information system that networks all facilities
- Internal QA team that make site visits (min quarterly)

Initial: *KG*

Date: *11/12/09*

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 2: How well does the proposed organizational structure (as indicated in the organizational chart and leadership staff qualifications) indicate sufficient management capability to perform the services required by the RFP? (*Weighted: 5 Max Pts: 25*)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

8-12

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

- clear chain of command with identified responsibilities for each member.
- management team has extensive experience in identified areas of operation

Initial: *K6*

Date: *11/12/09*

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 3: How well does the proposal clearly identify corporate oversight and support for the program?

(Weighted: 5 Max Pts: 25)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

3-8

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

- facility performance report that tracks key performance indicators.
- 24 access to corporate management
- Internal QA process

Initial: KG

Date: 11/12/07

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 4: How well does the proposal describe the vendor's internal quality improvement process? The quality improvement process is necessary to identify problems and improve processes.

(Weighted: 5 Max Pts: 25)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

6-8

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

- initial 90 day assessment plan
- 1/4 fidelity audit
- annual audit using Dept QA standards
- Florida regional UP holds weekly call w/QA team

Initial: KG

Date: 11/12/09

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 5: How well does the proposal describe the vendor's training protocols, including specifically a comprehensive training plan to sustain optimum program operations?
(Weighted: 5 Max Pts: 25)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

6, 40-42

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

- Training monitored continuously through computerized data base.
- Exceeds requirements for pre-service and in-service training

Initial: KG

Date: 11/12/07

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Category #2: Options

How well does the proposal document the ability to fulfill the obligations of the Options Clause stated in the Standard Contract and described in the RFP?

Consideration 1: How well does the proposal identify the provider's ability to increase units of service including maximum available beds/slots based on capacity? (*Weighted: 1 Max. Pts: 5*)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

13

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

meets req. of RFP
- addresses need to coordinate w/ local school board

Initial: *KG*

Date: *11/12/08*

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 2: How well does the proposal describe a plan and the ability to recruit additional staff, define its staffing needs, and provide timeframes for recruitment? (*Weighted: 1* *Max Pts: 5*)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

13

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

- provider has the ability to pull resources from other facilities in a short period of time.

Initial: KG

Date: 11/12/07

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 3: How well does the proposal identify the capability and flexibility to change restrictiveness level or gender served and add additional services to meet Department needs to treat youth on the waiting list?

(Weighted: 1 Max Pts: 5)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

13

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

- addressed all components of RFP and outlined a process in responding to service options.

Initial: KG

Date: 11/12/09

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Category 3: Staffing

How well does the vendor's proposed plan for its staffing levels demonstrate that it employs sufficient number of trained staff to perform the duties and responsibilities outlined in this RFP?

Consideration 1: How well does the proposal clearly outline required coverage of staff ratios for supervision (Example: 1:8 awake; 1:12 asleep, etc). as identified in the RFP, specifically addressing issues such as vacancies and absences?
(Weighted: 5 Max Pts: 25)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

10, 11, 16

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

*1.70 shift relief factor
- hold over roster to ensure ratios are met
during absences*

Initial: *KG*

Date: *11/12/09*

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 2: How well does the proposal address an appropriate relief factor to ensure required staff coverage?

(Weighted: 5 Max Pts: 25)

(Note: For example, using the recommended 1.66 relief factor, first you figure out the number of youth care staff required for each shift per the ratio requirements. For a 48-bed program, you would need 5 during day shift and 5 during evening shift for a 1:10 ratio and 4 during night shift for a 1:12 ratio. Total the number of staff required during each shift, 14 in this case, and multiply it by 1.66, it outlines that 23.24 (23) direct care staff are required. If the org chart and staffing information indicates that they have at least that number of direct care staff, they will have enough to provide the required supervision, if it is less, it's questionable).

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

10-11

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

1.70 relief factor for direct care staff.

Initial: *KG*

Date: *11/12/07*

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 3: How well does the proposal's staffing plan address the requirements of recruitment of qualified staff and sustain the level needed? (Weighted: 2 Max Pts: 10)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

4, 6, 7

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

*Provider has an HR specialist that recruits staff
through: Job fairs, advertisements and local resources
including community colleges.
- computerized system*

Initial: KG

Date: 11/12/09

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Category #4: Care and Custody Services

How well does the proposal provide for care and custody services as required by the RFP and Rule 63E-7?

Consideration1: How well does the vendor's proposal describe its ability to provide, at minimum, the following services required by Rule 63E-7:

- a) Youth Admission
- b) Youth Intake
- c) Youth Orientation
- d) Quality of Life and Youth Grievance Process
- e) Youth Hygiene and Dress Code
- f) Facility and Food Services
- g) Transfer, Release and Discharge
- h) Safety and Security
- i) Program Administration

(Weighted: 4 Max Pts: 20)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

14-16

17, 18

36

39-40

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

- mental health professional will conduct face/face interview w/all youth including full clinical assessment.
- utilize Phoenix Care Intervention Program

Initial: KG

Date: 11/12/09

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 2: How well does the proposal explain how the vendor will maintain youth engagement in activities and the treatment process so that at least 80% of their waking time is devoted to structured therapeutic activity, as required by the RFP?

(Weighted: 4 Max Pts: 20)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

18 -19

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

- schedule exceeds requirement of engagement in activities 80% of waking time.
- includes additional incentives/reward activities

Initial: *KG*

Date: *11/12/09*

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 3: How well does the proposal describe a tracking system for monitoring youth participation for adherence to a structured therapeutic activity schedule? (*Weighted: 4* *Max Pts: 20*)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

19

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

- Clinical director will utilize standard tracking system to monitor adherence to schedule.

Initial: KG

Date: 11/12/09

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 4: How well does the proposal support the successful implementation of the schedule (i.e.: are there enough trained staff; staff training support, appropriate number/level of staff planned into the schedule)? Does it outline a realistic schedule for youth?
(Weighted: 4 Max Pts: 20)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

6, 11, 18-19

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

- proposal identified appropriate staffing levels to adhere to the facility schedule
- staff training and support monitored through management team.

Initial: KG

Date: 11/12/09

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Category #5: Case Management Services

How well does the proposal describe the Case Management services required by the RFP?

Consideration 1: How well does the proposal describe the vendor's assessment process, staffing, etc., of the youth for criminogenic factors? (Weighted: 3 Max Pts: 15)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

19 -21

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

- case managers will be trained in MI and assess criminogenic risk factors using RPACT instrument.
- the assessment process will be enhanced using additional MI/SA instruments.

Initial: KG

Date: 11/12/09

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 2: How well does the proposal describe how the provider will complete individualized performance plans developed by a multidisciplinary treatment team in conjunction with youth? (*Weighted: 2* *Max Pts: 10*)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

19-21

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

- Exceeds requirement by completing performance plan w/ 21 days
- interventions are focused on reducing risk factors increasing protective factors and account for y's willingness to comply w/ treatment.

Initial: *KG*

Date: *11/12/09*

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 3: How well does the proposal detail how Motivational Interviewing is implemented by the vendor to promote engagement in delinquency intervention? (*Weighted: 2* *Max Pts: 10*)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

20 - 21

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

case managers have been trained in MI

- identifies process of utilizing MI to develop performance plans.

Initial:

KG

Date:

11/12/09

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 4: How well does the proposal outline the vendor's process for ensuring quarterly progress reports are provided to committing court, Department JPO and youth's parents? (*Weighted: 1 Max Pts: 5*)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

21

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

*met req. of RFP - outlined process to complete and submit
to appropriate persons w/ required timeframes.*

Initial: *KG*

Date: *11/12/09*

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 5: How well does the proposal describe how the vendor will identify and group youth within the program according to special characteristics for safety, health and treatment purposes, as specified and required by the RFP? *(Weighted: 2 Max Pts: 10)*

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

15-16

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

- provider conducts clinical assessment of each youth
- treatment team meets to review information at the time of admit.
- Phoenix Gang Intervention Program

Initial:

KG

Date:

11/12/09

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL RESIDENTIAL SERVICES

RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 6: How well does the proposal describe how the vendor will assess the youth for progress during delinquency interventions, as specified and required by the RFP? (Weighted: 2 Max Pts: 10)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

21

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

- re-assessment w/RPACT every 60 days

- monitored monthly by the treatment team using performance and treatment goals and objectives.

Initial:

KG

Date:

11/12/09

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 7: How well does the proposal outline the vendor capacity to coordinate services, obtain required consent documentation, and communicate with the custodial parent or guardian, the district or circuit liaison, the Department, the courts and other entities as needed? *(Weighted: 1 Max Pts: 5)*

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

19-21

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

- case manager assigned prior to admit - including review of ECP and verification of current (AET).

Initial:

KG

Date: *11/12/09*

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Category #6: Delinquency Programming

How well does the proposal describe a detailed plan for implementing an effective delinquency program?

Consideration 1: How well does the proposal describe the delinquency intervention model or curricula intended to be used?
(Weighted: 2 Max Pts: 10)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

36 - 37

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

- delinquency interventions are founded in MI and include all levels of staff at the facility.
- evidence based services will be utilized and provider has a process to monitor fidelity.

Initial: KG

Date: 11/12/09

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 2: How well does the proposal explain how the vendor will engage and retain the participation of the families of the youth in the program? *(Weighted: 3 Max Pts: 15)*

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

36

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

- proposal identifies process to engage parents in the admission process and throughout the tx. process.

Initial: KG

Date: 11/12/09

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 3: How well does the proposal describe the goals and objectives of the delinquency intervention program? *(Weighted: 2 Max Pts: 10)*

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

35-36

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

proposal clearly outlines goals/objectives of delinquency intervention program.

Initial: *KG*

Date: *11/12/09*

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 4: How well does the proposal explain how the interventions employed are considered to be an evidence-based or promising practice? (*Weighted: 2 Max Pts: 10*)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

35

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

T4C, Impact of Crime and YSI Strategic Model
- provider will use T4C curricula in a closed group setting. Youth pending group assignment will receive impact of crime curriculum.

Initial: *KG*

Date: *11/12/09*

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 5: How well does the proposal explain how delinquency interventions will be monitored to ensure fidelity to the original delinquency intervention model's design? (*Weighted: 2* *Max Pts: 10*)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

37-38

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

*fidelity monitored internally through Program Fidelity Committee,
peer reviews and youth surveys.*

- monitored externally through corporate QA team*
- Clinical Director identified as person responsible to monitor evidence based programming*
- use of (MISC) motivational Interviewing Skills Code to monitor MI practice.*

Initial: *KG*

Date: *11/12/09*

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Category #7: Visitation and Family Involvement

How well does the vendor present a comprehensive, coherent and appropriate strategy for involving and interacting with a youth's family?

Consideration 1: How well does the vendor provide ongoing and direct avenues of communication to the family members?
(Weighted: 1 Max Pts: 5)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

36, 43-44

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is Adequate).

- communication - during entire treatment process including assessment, treatment planning, family therapy and transition
- process for visitation, telephone and mail corr.
- no limit on volume of mail.

Initial: *KG*

Date: *11/12/09*

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 2: How well does the vendor include specific mechanisms for soliciting input from the family members? (Weighted: 1 Max Pts: 5)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

36

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

- info solicited from parents by case manager and therapist during the intake process and throughout the treatment process.

Initial: KG

Date: 11/12/09

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 3: How well does the vendor include provisions to allow youth to have access to visitors (family)? *(Weighted: 1 Max Pts: 5)*

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

43-44

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

- parents mailed copy of visitation schedule
- additional family activities inc. dinners, talent shows and ice cream socials.

Initial: *KG*

Date: *11/12/07*

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 4: How well does the proposal describe its capacity to provide for comfortable visitation areas? Weighted: 1 Max
Pts: 5

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

43

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

- located in multi purpose room
(spacious w/ murals on walls)

Initial: KG

Date: 11/12/09

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 5: How well does the visitation procedure address possible security concerns (escape, contraband, weapons, etc)?
(Weighted: 1 Max Pts: 5)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

43

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

- multi purpose room noted as being secure.
- process in place to screen visitors for authorization and security clearance

Initial:

KG

Date: *11/12/09*

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Category #8: Educational Services

How well does the proposal describe the educational services and coordination with the local school board?

Consideration 1: How well does the proposal specify the educational services to be provided and the manner in which those services will be provided? (Weighted: 1 Max Pts: 5)

(Helpful tips: It's the district's decision whether they provide educational services directly or enter into a contract with a private provider. If the provider is assuming responsibility for the education, they need to acknowledge the cooperative agreement between DJJ and the school district with an understanding of their responsibility to comply with all federal and state mandates, including exceptional student education services and requests of the district for special needs students such as itinerant services to students that are visually or hearing impaired or speakers of other languages.)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

38

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

- through contract w/ St. Johns School District
- education staff receive training on program philosophy
- maintain media center

Initial: KG

Date: 11/12/09

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 2: How well does the proposal detail direct care supervision of youth during school hours?
(Weighted: 2 Max Pts: 10)

(Helpful Tips: The proposal should detail how direct care staff are assigned to each classroom and reflect how educational personnel and students are assured safety and supervision consistent with the terms of the DJJ/School District cooperative agreement. When inadequate staff are present or classrooms are temporarily unavailable, flexible options should exist for combining classrooms, offering different locations and/or other strategies to minimize disruption to the educational process.)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

38

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

- proposal notes direct care staff will provide supervision in accordance w/requirements set forth in RFP.

Initial: KG

Date: 11/12/09

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 3: How well does the proposal describe how the provider will integrate the educational staff into the current Behavior Management System? (*Weighted: 2 Max Pts: 10*)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

38

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

- Teachers receive 16 hrs training in program philosophy, behavior management and motivation system.
- will work w/ local school board to incorporate education services into living environment and the behavior management system.

Initial: KG

Date: 11/12/09

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Category #9: Pre-Vocational and Vocational Services

How well does the proposal describe the traditional and non-traditional pre-vocational and vocational services to be provided and the manner in which the services will be provided?

Consideration 1: How well does the proposal describe how the vendor will coordinate the traditional and non-traditional pre-vocational and vocational services with the community resources? *(Weighted: 2 Max Pts: 10)*

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

38 -39

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is Adequate).

Pre-vocational services will be coordinated w/ local
school district and incorporated into treatment planning
process.
- assistance w/ occupational research and job placement
assistance.

Initial: KG

Date: 11/12/09

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 2: How well does the proposal describe how the vendor will assess youth's interest for a specific vocational area? How well is this training integrated into treatment goals and planning?

(Weighted: 3 Max Pts: 15)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

38 - 39

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

- Staff will assist youth w/ occupational research through the use of assessments, questionnaires and surveys.

- States services will be integrated into treatment planning process (no specific details)

Initial: KG

Date: 11/12/09

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Category #10: Discharge and Transition Services

How well does the proposal describe a detailed and feasible discharge and transition plan for ensuring that youth are discharge-ready prior to release?

Consideration 1: How well does the discharge and transition plan consider individual youth needs, characteristics, and risks?
(Weighted: 4 Max Pts: 20)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

25, 36, 39-40

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is Adequate).

- use of transition honors dnm to focus on specific characteristics needed for social reintegration.
- discharge planning begins on the date of adm.t w/ the initial needs assessment and through ongoing reassessments of the youth while progressing through each stage of the program

Initial: KG

Date: 11/12/09

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 2: How well does the vendor's proposal describe their discharge and transition plans and how the vendor will work with the community, the JPO, the courts, Department staff, and other partners in their discharge and transition planning? (*Weighted: 2*
Max Pts: 10)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

25, 36, 39-40

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

- meets RFP requirements by including all required persons during discharge planning process*
- intend to maintain a network of agencies within community to access services identified as needed upon discharge from the program*

Initial: *KLG*

Date: *11/12/09*

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 3: How well does the proposal demonstrate that discharge planning begins at admission?

(Weighted: 1 Max Pts: 5)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

40

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

Proposal identifies discharge planning at the time of adm. through initial needs assessment, supporting documentation and collaboration w/ therapist, education, medical, youth, parent and cr provider.

Initial: *KG*

Date: *11/12/09*

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Category #11: Staff Training

How well does the proposal describe a staff training plan as required in the RFP?

Consideration 1: How well does the provider's proposal demonstrate an understanding of the training necessary for direct care staff to perform their duties? (Weighted: 2 Max Pts: 10)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

6, 7, 40-42

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

- proposal exceeds the required pre-service and in-service training requirements.
- all directors and supervisors will complete leadership Development course training.

Initial: KG

Date: 11/12/09

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 2: How well does the proposal describe a comprehensive training plan to implement orientation and training programs for all new employees, within thirty (30) days of hire, and ongoing staff training to increase knowledge and skills to improve quality of care and training services (outlined in CORE), including specific job responsibilities, care and supervision of youth, first aid, episodic care and CPR as required by Rule 63-7 and the RFP.

(Weighted: 3 Max Pts: 15)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

6, 7 40-42

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

- training plan implemented within 15 days of date of hire.

- includes ongoing training requirements that exceed RFP

Initial: KG

Date: 11/12/09

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 3: How well does the proposal's training plan incorporate the principles of cultural competence and trauma informed care to reinforce non-confrontational interaction? (*Weighted: 3 Max Pts: 15*)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

35 46, 40-42

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

training plan includes cultural competence and trauma informed care training

Trauma informed care strategies are foundation for crisis interventions.

Initial: KG

Date: 11/12/09

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 4: How well does the proposal describe providing the training as required in the Health Services Manual (2006)?
(Weighted: 3 Max Pts: 15)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

40-42

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

training plan includes

confidentiality (HIPAA)

Fire Safety

med Distribution

med Alerts

Allergy Alerts

meets RFP req.

Initial: *KG*

Date: *11/12/09*

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Category #12: Behavioral Management System

How well does the proposal describe the Behavior Management System to be implemented?

Consideration 1: How well does the proposal describe the behavior management system, a positive behavior reinforcement system, and the underlying theory? (Weighted: 5 Max Pts: 25)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

44-47

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3. Adequate).

provider has a 4 level system that is tracked through a daily point card system.

- The behavior management system is focused on non violent interventions (behavioral interventions) and has an enhanced rewards system

Initial: KG

Date: 11/12/09

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 2: How well does the proposal explain how the vendor will prepare and plan with the youth for crisis prevention, as part of the Behavioral Management System? (*Weighted: 5* *Max Pts: 25*)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

46

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

- Incorporate a staff training program for crisis information and trauma informed care.
- utilize an alert system to monitor youth in potential crisis
- on-call clinician
- development of safety plan w/assigned therapist

Initial: KG

Date: 11/12/09

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 3: How well does the proposal describe a training plan for staff regarding the Behavior Management System?
(Weighted: 5 Max Pts: 25)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

41, 46

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

Training on behavior management system is incorporated into the pre-service training requirements.
- ongoing training will occur through internal meetings.

Initial: KG

Date: 11/12/09

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 4: How well does the proposal describe how the vendor will monitor the staff and youth's daily activities to ensure consistency with the treatment and the behavioral management philosophy? Weighted: 5 Max Pts: 25

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

46

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

Staff consistency will be monitored through the Program Fidelity Committee; including corporate staff site visits, QA teams and clinical reviewers.

Initial: KL

Date: 11/12/07

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 5: How well does the proposal's description of the Behavioral Management System ensure the rewards to punishment shall exceed the 4 rewards: 1 punishment ratio? (*Weighted: 5 Max Pts: 25*)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

46 - 47

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

Provider intends to exceed requirement w/5:1 ratio
Ex. incentives: movies, popcorn, fun friday and additional privileges
- monitored through point cards, incident reports and treatment planning process.

Initial: *KG*

Date: *11/12/09*

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 6: How well does the proposal describe the youth's motivational factors, determined via assessment, are taken into consideration when the Behavioral Management System(especially in regard to rewards and punishment for the youth), is established?
(Weighted: 4 Max Pts: 20)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

44-45

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

The behavior management system is defined in terms of individual expectations with assessment and re-assessment to determine motivational factors.

Initial:

KG

Date:

11/12/09

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Category #13: Religious Services and Recreational and Leisure Time Activities

How well does the proposal define a plan for access to Religious Services and Recreational and Leisure Time Activities, as required by the RFP?

Consideration 1: How well does the proposal describe youth input to ensure activities are meaningful to the youth and encourage positive interaction and participation? (*Weighted: 3 Max Pts: 15*)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

42

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is Adequate).

*Youth Advisory Board
Conduct town hall meetings
Complete surveys*

Initial: *KG*

Date: *11/12/09*

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 2: How well does the proposal describe a schedule for religious services and recreational and leisure time activities (including weekends)? (*Weighted: 2* *Max Pts: 10*)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

18-19 47-48

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

Rec / Leisure 7x week

Religious Activities 4x week

facility schedule

- includes a chaplaincy program for residents.*
- rec includes creative arts program and Presidents Challenge Program*

Initial: *KG*

Date: *11/12/07*

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 3: How well does the proposal's staffing pattern allow for adequate coverage for religious services and recreational and leisure time activities as offered? (*Weighted: 2* *Max Pts: 10*)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

11, 16

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

Proposal provides adequate staffing pattern to allow for scheduled religious and rec opportunities.

Initial: *KG*

Date: *11/12/09*

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 4: How well does the proposal describe access to religious services?

(Weighted: 2 Max Pts: 10)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

47 - 48

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

- religious activities are provided 3x during week and 1x on weekend.

- access to pastoral care.

- voluntary participation

Initial: KG

Date: 11/12/09

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Category #14: Restorative Justice Programming

How well does the proposal describe a plan to provide Restorative Justice Programming?

Consideration 1: How well does the proposal describe a plan for providing Impact of Crime training to staff and implementation of an Impact of Crime program? (*Weighted: 5* *Max Pts: 25*)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

41 48 - 50

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

- impact of crime included in facility training plan
- impact of crime philosophy is incorporated into treatment planning process, competency development, community service, victim and community involvement.

Initial: KG

Date: 11/12/08

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 2: How well does the proposal document that the program supports the restorative justice philosophy?
(Weighted: 2 Max Pts: 10)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

48-50

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and /or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

restorative justice philosophy is supported through
community advisory board, give back program, Impact
of crime instruction and community service learning
program.

Initial: KG

Date: 11/12/09

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.

**EVALUATION QUESTION SCORE SHEET PACKET FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES
RFP# R2084 "34-BED MODERATE RISK PROGRAM FOR BOYS"**

Name of Prospective Provider: YOUTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Name of Evaluator: KEVIN GEORGE

Consideration 3: How well does the proposal's described Restorative Justice Programming plan create opportunities for youth to be actively involved, give input, participate in decisions, practice leadership roles, use restorative conflict resolution strategies, and contribute to the community? (Weighted: 3 Max Pts: 15)

Score (Check One Number Only)

Not Addressed	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Page #: (In this block, please list the page number where information was found in the provider's proposal that led to your scoring decision. Please identify any pages found in addition to those pages listed in Attachment O, if applicable).

42

Notation and Comments: (In this block, please briefly notate information found in the proposal, including strengths and/or weaknesses and/or concerns and/or exemplary findings, which help explain the above scoring decision. You should notate something as a reminder of your thought process utilized in determining the above numerical score. There must be a notation, even if the score is 3, Adequate).

- Youth Advisory Board utilized to solicit input into programming
- Community Service Learning - process that allows youth opportunities to gain insight into community service projects and community impact.
- Give Back Program - utilized to bring proposal meaning to community service projects.

Initial: KLG

Date: 11/12/09

Excellent	5	The proposal exceeds all technical specifications and requirements for the service component specified. The approach is innovative, comprehensive, and complete in every detail.
Very Good	4	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified. The approach is comprehensive and complete in every detail. The proposal approach contains some innovative details for some of the components specified.
Adequate	3	The proposal meets all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified.
Poor	2	The proposal does not meet all technical specifications and requirements for the component specified, or it demonstrates minimum understanding of the requirements for the component specified.
Unsatisfactory	1	The proposal fails to demonstrate the provider's understanding of the requirements for the component specified or the ability to provide the service.
Not Addressed	0	The provider's proposal does not address the service component(s) specified, or the evaluator is not able to locate the information in the provider's proposal.